DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 243 217 EA 016 713

AUTHOR	Kronkosky, Preston C.; And Others
TITLE	Title I Seminar for the Central States. Report of Conference Proceedings (Austin, Texas, January 20-22, 1982).
INSTITUTION	Southwest Educational Development Lab., Austin, Tex.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Education, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	82
CONTRACT	400-81-0034
NOTE	49p.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Classroom Techniques; Compensatory Education; *Conference Proceedings; Educational Administration; Educational Environment; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Program Implementation; Teacher Improvement; *Technical Assistance
IDENTIFIERS	*Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 1; United States (Central)

ABSTRACT

This report covers proceedings of a conference designed to help state Title I staff carry out their responsibilities under Chapter 1 of the Educational Consolidation and Improvement Act to provide technical assistance to local districts. The general purposes of the seminar were (1) to provide participants with research-based tools that would help them assist local staff to focus on several important aspects of Title I programs and (2) to inform participants of resources that can be used to help district staff improve the basic skills component of their programs. The report's longest section describes the three conference sessions--providing technical assistance and using resource bases, approaches to effective inservice, and classroom management--as well as related small-group presentations and mini-sessions. Participant concerns, issues raised during the sessions, and suggestions for followup activities are outlined. and conference evaluation results are summarized. Appendixes include the seminar agenda, a list of presenters, a directory of participants, and session evaluation data. (MJL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED243217

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

TITLE I SEMINAR FOR THE CENTRAL STATES

January 20 - 22, 1982

Austin, Texas

EA 016 713

REPORT OF CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

for the

TITLE I SEMINAR FOR THE CENTRAL STATES

January 20 - 22, 1982

Austin, Texas

Hosted by

CEMREL, Inc.
St. Louis, Missouri

and

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory
Austin, Texas

This report is made pursuant to contract #400-81-0034. The amount charged to the Department of Education for the work resulting in this report (inclusive of the amount so charged for any prior reports submitted under this contract) is estimated at $25,366. The names of the persons, employed or retained by the Contractor, with managerial or professional responsibilities for such work, or for the content of the report, are as follows:

Preston C. Kronkosky, Principal Investigator
Anna Hundley
Nancy Baker Jones
Barbara Baylor
Martha Boethel
Ginger Pfister

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction 1

II. Sessions

A. Opening Session 3
B. Session 1: Providing Technical Assistance and Using Resource Bases 3
C. Session 2: Effective Inservice - A Variety of Approaches 6
D. Session 3: Classroom Management 7
E. Minisessions 9
F. Session Wrapup 11

III. Issues, Concerns, and Suggestions for Follow-Up Activities 13

IV. Evaluation 15

Appendices

Appendix A: Conference Agenda
Appendix B: List of Presenters
Appendix C: List of Participants
Appendix D: Evaluation Data for Individual Sessions

INTRODUCTION

The Title I Seminar for the Central States was one of three regional conferences whose general purpose was to assist state Title I staff in carrying out their responsibilities, under Chapter I of the Educational Consolidation and Improvement Act, to provide technical assistance to local Title I staffs. The seminar was designed:

- to provide state Title I staff with a number of research-based tools which would help them assist local district staff to focus on several of the important aspects of Title I programs--specifically, the management of classrooms and the design and conduct of inservice programs; and

- to provide state Title I staff with information about and experience with a number of resources which they can access and use to help local district staff improve the basic skills component of their programs.

The seminar, funded by Title I through the National Institute of Education (NIE) and hosted by the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory's Regional Exchange (SEDL/RX) in collaboration with the CEMREL Regional Exchange, was held in Austin, Texas, January 20-22, 1982. Participants from the 14 states in the SEDL and CEMREL regions included state Title I coordinators and members of their staff, National Diffusion Network (NDN) state facilitators, representatives from selected local Title I programs, and advisory board members from the SEDL and CEMREL Regional Exchanges.

The seminar's structure, format, and general content areas were determined through a conference planning process which involved federal officials from NIE, Title I, and the NDN, as well as representatives from the host institutions for the seminars to be held in the eastern and western states. As part of the planning process, SEDL and CEMREL also surveyed state Title I staffs in the fourteen states to obtain their input regarding the conference agenda.

In preparing the agenda and selecting presenters, SEDL and CEMREL sought not only to include those persons who could most effectively address the technical assistance needs of Title I coordinators, but also to reflect the diversity among available resource persons, in terms of race, ethnicity, gender, geography, and institutional affiliation. Conference staff felt--and the resulting agenda demonstrated--that the two goals of excellence and diversity among presenters were in no way incompatible.

Format of the two-day seminar called for three major sessions designed to provide an overview of research on each major topic--providing technical assistance, conducting effective inservice, and organizing and managing classroom instruction. In addition, a number of related small group sessions and minisessions offered opportunities to use materials, discuss issues, and share experiences.

The following sections of this report provide a description of each conference session, a summary of participant concerns and issues raised during the sessions, suggestions for follow-up activities, and a summary of conference evaluation results.

CONFERENCE SESSIONS

SEMINAR OPENING AND KEYNOTE

The conference got underway with greetings from the host staff and opening speeches by three representatives of the federal Department of Education. William Lobosco, Director of the Division of Program Development of the Title I Office in Washington, D.C., and Scott Tuxhorn, the Secretary of Education's Regional Representative from Region VI, both emphasized that Title I programs have demonstrated their effectiveness through national, state, and local evaluation data, and that current federal policies are aimed at providing more flexibility for improving local practice. The seminar's keynote speaker, Brent Marriott, Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education in the Department of Education, reinforced these statements, noting that Title I is "probably the single most successful program administered by the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education." Marriott explained that the goal of the federal office now is to create a partnership with the states, who must in turn create a partnership with local school staffs. He outlined the tasks of state education staffs in contributing to local improvement as: (1) facilitating good management; (2) expanding resources; and (3) motivating teachers.

SESSION I: PROVIDING TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND USING RESOURCE BASES

Session Overview. Sheila Rosenblum, of Abt Associates, Inc., presented the overview, offering evidence from research and public policy analysis as to why technical assistance is important, describing its basic premises, and raising some of the issues which state education agencies (SEAs) need to address in order to design and manage a technical assistance system. Rosenblum defined technical assistance as "a process of providing the best available information, guidance, and help, in an appropriate time and manner in order to increase the effectiveness of local educational practice." She cited implementation studies which concluded that, while local commitment to change is the most essential factor in successful implementation, without external assistance schools may not be able to make effective decisions about what and how to implement.

Rosenblum focused primarily on the linkage perspective of technical assistance, and noted that it is not necessary to be an expert in any given subject to be an effective technical assister. Cautioning against overinvolvement and "self-ownership" of local activities, she emphasized that "building local capacity may be

the most valuable impact of a school improvement effort." In conclusion, she outlined issues to be considered in establishing a technical assistance function: how to structure the technical assistance role (intensity and scope of involvement); what type(s) of assistance to offer (e.g., resource finding vs. problem-solving); how to select individuals as technical assisters; where to locate the role (centralized vs. decentralized); how to manage field agents; and how to address the need for training and support.

Small Group 1: What is Technical Assistance? Pascal Trohanis, director of Technical Assistance Development Systems (TADS) at the University of North Carolina in Chapel Hill, presented the TADS approach to technical assistance (TA) and, in doing so, pointed out the key parameters in designing and operating a technical assistance system. The TADS approach is based on a five-step sequence of activities: (1) program planning; (2) needs assessment (which can be conducted on site or via written forms); (3) development of a TA agreement which specifies objectives of the TA, who will do what, how the TA will be evaluated, and the expected impact; (4) TA delivery; and (5) evaluation of the TA, which usually consists of a written follow-up survey.

Trohanis emphasized that the technical assistance coordinator, the person who plans and negotiates the TA activity, is the person who makes the system work; he or she functions as a linker, resource specialist, project advocate, and administrative assistant, and must possess effective communication skills. Trohanis also noted that it is necessary to "market" technical assistance services: to make people aware of the services, gain entry to local systems, and demonstrate competence.

Small Group 2: Bring About School Change. The Educational Renewal Model for Arkansas (ERMA), a method for improving school district practices through their own goals, priorities, and needs, was presented by Mary Gunter, Arkansas NDN State Facilitator. The ERMA process provides school districts with linkers who help the district identify problems, then locate the information, resources, programs, and consultants that are needed to solve the problems. The linkers also help districts get into the educational renewal process, by holding workshops about processes for systematic decisionmaking, and guiding local staff through project activities. Project strategies are grounded in educational research, and the process has been field-tested successfully in three school districts over a three-year period.

Small Group 3: Identifying Regional Resources for Technical Assistance. Nancy Baker Jones of the SEDL Regional Exchange and Greg Goodman from the CEMREL Regional Exchange provided session

participants with information about agencies and publications which can offer support to providers of educational technical assistance. The session included handouts with extensive resource listings, and a handout describing the process of question negotiation, the avenue through which providers of technical assistance determine the precise need of their clients. Presenters answered participant questions about specific resources available within the SEDL and CEMREL regions.

Small Group 4: Identifying Essential Program Elements. Gene Hall and Shirley Hord from the Research on Improvement of Practice Division of The University of Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education introduced two major concepts which have emerged from their research on program implementation. Levels of Use provides a mechanism for assessing the degree to which innovations are being implemented, and thus a basis for determining further training/technical assistance needs. Innovation Configuration provides a method of identifying the major components of an innovation and the variations possible in implementing each component; from this information, component checklists are developed which can be used to diagnose, monitor, and evaluate implementation efforts.

These concepts are a part of the Research and Development Center's Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM), an implementation model which assumes that change is a process, not an event, which entails developmental growth in the feelings and skills of the individuals implementing the change.

Small Group 5: Basic Skills and Compensatory Education. Sandra Nichols, Program Specialist with the Texas Education Agency's Compensatory Education Program, presented an overview of the Texas Basic Skills Improvement Plan. The plan focuses on a unified and unduplicated effort of coordination of all resources, including general education (including bilingual), ESEA Title I, State Compensatory Education, Special Education, and others, to improve student performance in reading, mathematics, and writing. In developing the plan, Agency staff identified characteristics common to educational programs that have proven successful in producing essential levels of student achievement for all pupil populations. Classroom models which incorporate these characteristics then were developed for teachers to use in managing instruction, along with campus and district models to support classroom activities. In addition, the common characteristics were used to identify teacher and administrator competencies for staff development activities, and leadership activities for education service centers and Texas Education Agency support were defined.

SESSION II: EFFECTIVE INSERVICE--A VARIETY OF APPROACHES

Session Overview. The overview of inservice was presented by Lovely Billups, Assistant Director of the Educational Research and Dissemination Project of the American Federation of Teachers. She stated that research indicates no one best way to approach effective inservice; the task is to share multiple solutions. However, she noted, inservice activities should try to emulate the methods found most effective with adult learners, rather than operate on the old--and false--assumption that adults and children learn in the same way. Citing the research into adult learning, she emphasized the importance of: the learner's experience as a basis for teaching; exchange between teacher and learner, through mutual inquiry and group discussion; motivation--through life-oriented teaching; and allowance for variations in cognitive learning styles.

Billups also stressed the importance of effectively evaluating inservice efforts, but providing flexibility in evaluation designs to account for all possible effects, including social and psychological effects, of the activities.

Small Group 1: Linking Teachers to Research. Lovely Billups also conducted a small-group session, in which she provided participants with opportunities to explore ways in which research findings have been successfully translated for teacher use in the classroom. She stressed that meaningful change occurs as a process, not as an event; trainers must be aware of the appropriate entry level for those who are being trained and must pursue a course which utilizes direct personal intervention. She noted further that descriptive, instructional, and support materials must be accessible to teachers during the process, and administrative support of the process is crucial to its success.

Small Group 2: Useful Research for Staff Development. Gary Griffin, Director of the Research in Teacher Education Program of The University of Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, discussed four research-derived strategies for engaging Title I personnel in staff development activities. He presented information regarding schools as social systems; peer group strategies; interactive research and development on schooling; and an approach to staff development based on curriculum planning knowledge and skills. He advocated an "eclectic" approach to staff development, drawing on the inservice strategies and program characteristics which are most applicable to the unique needs and concerns of each local school.

Small Group 3: An Inservice Model for Modifying Teacher Behavior. Jane Stallings, Director of the Process of Teaching Basic Reading Skills in the Secondary Schools Project at the

Teaching and Learning Institute, Mountain View, California, introduced a mastery teaching model for training teachers to use time effectively. Key features of the program's delivery system are to: (1) state the staff development objectives; (2) select or develop instruments to measure relevant teacher behavior; (3) pretest teachers; (4) provide the staff development; (5) observe teachers; and (6) measure the behavior change. Program content focuses on the effective use of time by teachers, with emphasis on interactive instruction and maximizing student time-on-task.

Small Group 4: Models and Guidelines for Staff Development and Inservice. Al King, Senior Researcher with SEDL's Ways to Improve Education in Desegregated Schools Project, led a discussion of trends and developments, research results, and various models and types of inservice education. He emphasized inservice education as a process; discussion focused on all elements of the process: planning, preparation, implementation/delivery, application/adoption, and evaluation. King provided participants with forms and checklists for inservice education planning; he also focused on the importance of leadership, advantages of a collaborative approach, and the necessity of follow-up. In addition to discussing inservice education in general, he explored guidelines for inservice related to multicultural education and integrating the desegregated school.

Small Group 5: An Inservice Model for Improving Student Attitudes Toward School. The Positive Attitudes Toward Learning Project was introduced by John Zirges, Inservice Specialist with the Bethalto, Illinois project. His presentation focused on the key elements for implementing and sustaining educational improvements in inservice training programs, on the relationship of Title I teachers' skills to their students' attitudes toward learning, and on the relevance of the Positive Attitude Toward Learning's inservice component to Title I teachers and coordinators. Activities included a discussion of the criteria identified through the Rand Corporation's study of implementation as essential to effective implementation; a small group activity in which participants identified specific teaching skills which enable Title I and other teachers to improve students' attitudes toward self, school, and learning; and a simulation of techniques which enable Title I teachers to become "significant" to more of their students.

SESSION III: CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

Session Overview: The overview on classroom management was presented by David Holdzkom, Director of CEMREL's Research and

Development Interpretation Service. Holdzkom reviewed the results of research studies which have focused on how effective teachers manage their classrooms, which materials and learning activities are used, and how time is spent in classrooms. However, he cautioned that much of this research demonstrates only correlations, not cause and effect, and is based on standardized test scores, which pose special problems for many students and are unable to measure affective change.

Grouping research results into the four strands of opportunity for learning, motivators, structure, and instructional events, Holdzkom noted the following characteristics of effectively managed classrooms: (1) physical arrangements reinforce the teaching/learning style and objectives; (2) time is spent on teaching/learning, rather than on management, grading papers, etc.; (3) rules and procedures are uniform and consistently enforced, and have been taught to pupils; (4) teachers, parents, and administrators share clearly articulated goals, which are communicated to all students; (5) curriculum and tests are consonant; (6) opportunities and occasions for off-task behavior are minimized; (7) the school environment provides strong leadership, high expectations for students, positive reinforcement, and an orderly, pleasant, happy atmosphere; and (8) reading is strongly emphasized.

Small Group 1: Classroom Organization and Effective Teaching. Ed Emmer, Acting Director of The University of Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education's Classroom Organization and Effective Teaching Project, summarized research on classroom management with special emphasis on the elementary and junior high/middle school grades. He reviewed the research base for knowledge about management and its relationship to student achievement in basic skills, placing special emphasis on the beginning of the year as a critical period in classroom life. Behaviors and activities used by teachers who are effective classroom managers were described and illustrated, using written case study materials and videotape segments. Emmer emphasized four keys to maintaining good classroom management: active monitoring; stopping inappropriate behavior quickly; consistent use of consequences; and maintaining task orientation and high levels of student accountability for work.

Small Group 2: The Role of the Principal in Improving Basic Skills Instruction. Jane Stallings presented information, based on research conducted in classrooms and schools during the past ten years, about the role of the principal in achieving success in basic skills instruction. She focused on ways to conduct and analyze effective school policies and leadership style, effective use of classroom time, and simple classroom observation systems. Among the outcomes she reported were the following: in schools

where students, teachers, and administrators collaborated in reviewing and developing school policies, teacher morale was higher and teachers were more committed to teaching; in schools where policies were clear and consistent and were communicated to students, students evidenced less misbehavior and were absent less often; effective teachers had principals who were supportive of their efforts, sharing ideas, encouraging teacher growth, and providing opportunities for collaborative staff development.

Small Group 3: Management Techniques for Multiethnic Learning Teams. John Hollifield of the Student Team Learning Project at the Center for Social Organization of Schools in Baltimore, presented information about ways in which the Student Team Learning instructional process can be used by teachers to effectively manage heterogeneous classrooms and improve students' basic skills learning and interpersonal relations. The session included participation by attendees in a Student Team Learning process, discussion of technical assistance availability such as inservice training and use of certified trainers, and discussion of the use of team learning modules for conducting various in-service training workshops. Hollifield explained and demonstrated the basic idea behind the Student Team Learning techniques: that when students learn in small, carefully structured learning teams and are rewarded for working toward a common goal, they help one another, gain in self-esteem and feelings of individual responsibility for their learning, and increase in respect and liking for their classmates, including their classmates of other races.

Small Group 4: An Early Childhood Management Program. Geraldine H. Jenkins, Director of the East St. Louis Direct Instruction Follow Through Program, focused her presentation on management techniques which motivate and stimulate students' interest in learning, and on the interrelatedness of parents and students in the implementation of successful instructional programs and the scheduling of language and reading activities for home and school. She shared techniques for changing negative environments into positive learning centers, and focused on specific classroom management techniques such as time management, grouping, rules for the classroom, and positive reinforcement. Jenkins provided participants with sample exercises, including checklists of supervisory skills and a classroom management assessment form; she also provided work sheets which teachers can use in daily planning.

MINISESSIONS

Minisession 1: Summary of Evaluation and Quality Control in Title I Programs. Karen Rowlett, Assistant Project Director of

the Region 6 Title I Technical Assistance Center, addressed current and projected requirements for evaluating Title I programs. She identified essential components of the SEA role in reviewing, monitoring, and improving local program evaluation procedures, and established basic steps SEA personnel can take to assure quality evaluation data. She also related the quality control role of SEA personnel to state-level decisions necessary for continuation of Title I evaluation under the new Chapter I guidelines. She concluded her presentation with an exercise to develop a state plan for improving quality of local evaluation data, which involved: (1) identifying ways of correcting common errors in reporting of evaluation data; (2) developing a timeline of activities for improving quality of data; and (3) planning methods by which the state could provide guidance to LEAs with respect to quality control.

Minisession 2: Process Evaluation. Betty Henslee, of the Louisiana State Department of Education's Title I Office, discussed a program for process evaluation which was implemented in Louisiana in 1979. Defining process evaluation as "a systematic approach to describing, examining and making changes to various characteristics of a Title I program, both during the program and at the end of the program," Henslee explained that the process evaluation program had been initiated because the Title I staff felt that test scores did not provide sufficient information about the effectiveness of local programs. She listed the major steps involved in conducting a process evaluation: (1) describe the program as planned; (2) describe the program as implemented; (3) identify program discrepancies; and (4) make programmatic changes. She explained that process evaluation can reveal such information as: what planned activities were implemented; what circumstances changed the implementation of activities; what effect a change of plans had on the activities; which activities were most critical to the program; and what alternative activities can be implemented.

Minisession 3: Title I/NDN Collaboration: A Case Study. Nancy Moore, Illinois NDN State Facilitator, and Jolene Schultz, Missouri NDN State Facilitator, presented a session familiarizing participants with the National Diffusion Network. They discussed examples of Title I/NDN collaboration, with an emphasis on possible continuation and potential for additional Title I/NDN linkages. They also discussed ways in which regional and local educators can gain access to the validated processes and products available through the National Diffusion Network.

Minisession 4: Motivating Secondary School Delinquents and Dropouts. Donald May, Project Administrator of the FOCUS Dissemination Project, Hastings, Minnesota, presented an overview of FOCUS, a successful high school program for dealing with

disaffected youth. The FOCUS Model uses a mini-school approach that operates in cooperation with and as an extension of existing programs and services provided by the district. Classes in FOCUS include English, social studies, American history, math, Family Group, and work experiences for senior high school students. The FOCUS program differs from other mini-school concepts dealing with alienated students in its Family Group atmosphere, which emphasizes care, nurturance, and structure in its approach to students. Students are confronted with their unacceptable behavior and positively reinforced for acting in socially acceptable ways. Staff are selected from volunteers from the existing teaching staff to cover the offered subject areas; each staff member also is involved in at least one Family Group. Staff members are selected who are willing to experiment with different techniques and approaches in dealing with students. The FOCUS team offers an interdisciplinary approach which combines individualized instruction and group work based on the student's ability and needs.

Minisession 5: Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA) 1981: Michigan's Approach. Phil Hawkins, Director of Planning for the Michigan State Department of Education, focused his presentation on the implications of the ECIA for ESEA Title I and the programs consolidated under Chapter 2 of the Act. His emphasis was on the potential relationship between Chapter 2, the "Block Grant," and Chapter 1 in the future. Hawkins presented a filmstrip outling major provisions of the ECIA, reviewed the provisions and status of ECIA, reviewed the possibilities for establishing allocation formulas for funding, and outlined potential SEA activities, which include: needs assessment assistance; curriculum assistance, evaluation assistance; interagency cooperation; and audit. Using Michigan as an example, he described the funding impact of the block grants and Chapter I, and described Michigan's activities in planning and allocating resources under the new provisions.

SEMINAR WRAPUP

Wilbert A. Cheatham, Director of Compensatory Education Programs of the Department of Education's Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, made the final presentation to conference participants. He focused on the Administration's concern for improving the quality of local programs as the burdens of regulation and paperwork are diminished, and emphasized the importance of the shift in roles for state Title I staffs from monitoring compliance to providing technical assistance. He explained that the new regulations for Title I programs (which implement Chapter

I of the ECIA), while de-emphasizing federal requirements, address some issues beyond funding, including: maintenance of effort, student selection, comparability, and evaluation. Finally, he urged participants to plan with federal officials to take the next steps in implementing the new Chapter I, and to take an active role in disseminating information about the effectiveness of Title I programs.

ISSUES, CONCERNS, AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES

ISSUES AND CONCERNS

Major areas of concern expressed by participants throughout the conference sessions included the following:

- How to maintain and improve services to clients in the face of more and more severe budget cuts;
- How to make the shift from a monitoring role to a technical assistance role;
- Whether it is possible to be both compliance monitor and technical assister, or whether the two roles are incompatible;
- How to provide technical assistance when many or most potential clients are not actively seeking help; and
- Whether, as programs are deregulated at the federal level, state-level regulation will increase.

The concerns of conference presenters often reflected those expressed by participants, particularly in regard to potential conflicts between monitoring and technical assistance roles, and to funding cuts. In addition, conference presentations repeatedly focused on the following:

- The importance of time-on-task as a factor in improving student achievement;
- The necessity for personal intervention as a catalyst for change/program improvement;
- The need for a systematic process for conducting all activities (including program implementation, staff development, and provision of technical assistance) which includes the following steps: preplanning, needs assessment, and measurement of outcomes; and
- The need for collaboration and participatory decision-making, between teachers and administrators, between local and state officials, between local officials and technical assisters, and between state and federal officials.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES

The high level of personal concern expressed by many state-level participants in this seminar relates to what some regard as lack of clear direction in their roles. Will technical assistance be emphasized? Is monitoring ended? Are the two roles to be combined? Can they be combined successfully? These questions surfaced during the seminar. All but the last can only be answered at the federal level. The answer to the last question is probably no, at least not by one person. The success of technical assistance efforts by state Title I staff in the future will depend on experience they have in conducting it and the support they can expect to get if they wish to sharpen the skills needed to provide such assistance. Follow-up, therefore, should consist, first, of a clear statement of state Title I staff roles and, second, of the provision of training support for those roles.

EVALUATION

Conference participants were asked to evaluate the seminar as a whole and to assess the relevance and effectiveness of each small-group and minisession they attended. In addition, all participants were sent a followup evaluation form approximately one month after the seminar was held. Overall summaries of participant responses are provided below; more detailed evaluation information about specific sessions is included in Appendix D.

Participants were asked to rate their reasons for attending the seminar. In both the summary and followup evaluations, the two reasons rated most strongly were "Information useful back home" (72% of respondents on the summary evaluation gave this item the strongest rating, along with 57% of respondents on the followup evaluation), and "Topics relevant to my job" (60% on summary evaluation; 61% on followup). In assessing the seminar as a whole, respondents expressed the greatest satisfaction with the way staff and presenters managed the conference; the seminar's format, atmosphere, and facilities; the accuracy and helpfulness of preconference materials; and the clarity of conference objectives. A majority of respondents also felt that conference presentations and materials were clear and applicable to their work, and that the seminar provided knowledge and skills which they could use in their work.

In evaluating specific seminar sessions, participants tended to rate the small groups and minisessions higher than the large group, or overview, sessions. Participant comments also indicated that specific, content-focused information was their principal concern; a number of respondents indicated dissatisfaction with the length and character of the opening session, and the number of "political types" included as introductory speakers.

Comments from participants on the summary and followup evaluation surveys also indicated that information and resources from the seminar will be incorporated into local practice, via:

- sharing of seminar materials;
- adaptation and use of seminar techniques/approaches;
- use of resource persons identified at seminar; and
- collaboration with seminar presenters and/or other participants.

APPENDIX A

CONFERENCE AGENDA

TITLE I SEMINAR AGENDA

Wednesday, January 20, 1982

10:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.	REGISTRATION (Lunch on your own)
1:00 p.m. - 1:30 p.m.	SEMINAR ORIENTATION
	Wilbert A. Cheatham Director of Compensatory Education Programs Office of Elementary and Secondary Education U. S. Department of Education Washington, DC
	Anna Hundley Seminar Coordinator Regional Exchange Project Southwest Educational Development Laboratory Austin, Texas
	Preston C. Kronkosky Acting Executive Director Southwest Educational Development Laboratory Austin, Texas
	GREETINGS
	Scott Tuxhorn Secretary's Regional Representative U. S. Department of Education Dallas, Texas
1:30 p.m. - 2:00 p.m.	SEMINAR KEYNOTE
	Brent Marriott Special Assistant to Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education U. S. Department of Education Washington, DC
2:00 p.m. - 2:15 p.m.	BREAK
2:15 p.m. - 5:15 p.m.	SESSION I: PROVIDING TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND USING RESOURCE BASES

2:15 p.m. - 3:00 p.m. SESSION OVERVIEW

Sheila Rosenblum
Abt Associates, Inc.
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

3:00 p.m. - 3:15 p.m. BREAK

3:15 p.m. - 5:15 p.m. SMALL GROUP SESSIONS

GROUP 1: What is Technical Assistance? How do you Resolve Conflict Between Roles of Monitor and Technical Assistor?

Pascal Trohanis
Director, Technical Assistance Development Systems
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

GROUP 2: Bringing About School Change

Mary Gunter
Arkansas NDN State Facilitator
Educational Renewal Model for Arkansas
Prairie Grove, Arkansas

GROUP 3: Identifying Regional Resources for Technical Assistance

Nancy Baker Jones
Senior Dissemination Specialist
Regional Exchange Project
Southwest Educational Development Laboratory
Austin, Texas

Greg Goodman
Needs Assessment and Dissemination Specialist
Regional Exchange Project
CEMREL, Inc.
St. Louis, Missouri

GROUP 4: Identifying Essential Program Elements

Gene Hall
Division Coordinator
Research on Improvement of Practice
The University of Texas Research and Development Center
Austin, Texas

Shirley Hord
Coordinator of Field Services
The University of Texas Research and Development Center
Austin, Texas

GROUP 5: Basic Skills and Compensatory Education--
Tying It All Together

Sandra Nichols
Program Specialist
Compensatory Education Program
Texas Education Agency
Austin, Texas

5:15 p.m. FREE TIME/DINNER ON YOUR OWN

Thursday, January 21, 1982

8:00 a.m. - 8:30 a.m. Coffee & Juice

8:30 a.m. - 12 noon SESSION II:
EFFECTIVE INSERVICE--A VARIETY OF APPROACHES

8:30 a.m. - 9:15 a.m. SESSION OVERVIEW

Lovely Billups
Assistant Director, Educational Issues
Educational Research and Dissemination Project
American Federation of Teachers
Washington, DC

9:15 a.m. - 9:30 a.m. BREAK

9:30 a.m. - 12 noon SMALL GROUP SESSIONS

GROUP 1: Linking Teachers to Research

Lovely Billups
Assistant Director, Educational Issues
Educational Research and Dissemination Project
American Federation of Teachers
Washington, DC

GROUP 2: Useful Research for Staff Development: An Eclectic Approach

Gary Griffin
Program Director
Research in Teacher Education
The University of Texas Research and Development Center
Austin, Texas

GROUP 3: An Inservice Model for Modifying Teacher Behavior

Jane Stallings
Director
The Process of Teaching Basic Reading Skills in
Secondary Schools Project
Teaching and Learning Institute
Mountain View, California

GROUP 4: Models and Guidelines for Staff Development and Inservice

Al King
Senior Researcher
Ways to Improve Education in Desegregated Schools Project
Southwest Educational Development Laboratory
Austin, Texas

GROUP 5: An Inservice Model for Improving Student Attitude Toward School

John Zirges
Inservice Specialist
Positive Attitudes Toward Learning Project
Bethalto, Illinois

12 noon - 1:30 p.m. FREE TIME/LUNCH ON YOUR OWN

1:30 p.m. - 3:00 p.m. MINI SESSIONS

SESSION 1: Summary of Evaluation and Quality Control in Title I Programs

Karen Rowlett
Assistant Project Director
Title I Technical Assistance Center, Region 6
Austin, Texas

SESSION 2: Process Evaluation

Betty Henslee
Title I Office
State Department of Education
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

SESSION 3: Title I/NDN Collaboration: A Case Study

Nancy Moore
Assistant Director
Illinois NDN State Facilitator
Metropolis, Illinois

Jolene Schultz
Missouri NDN State Facilitator
Columbia, Missouri

SESSION 4: Motivating Secondary School Delinquents and Dropouts

Donald G. May
Project Administrator
Focus Dissemination Project
Hastings, Minnesota

SESSION 5: Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA) 1981: Michigan's Approach

Phil Hawkins
Director of Planning
Michigan State Department of Education
Lansing, Michigan

SESSION 6: Techniques for Teaching Oral Language to the Spanish Dominant Child

Yolanda Gonzales
Project Consultant
Corpus Christi Follow Through
Corpus Christi, Texas

Leticia Castaneda
Resource Center Specialist
Corpus Christi Follow Through
Corpus Christi, Texas

3:00 p.m. - 3:30 p.m.	BREAK
3:30 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.	MINI SESSIONS
ALL SESSIONS LISTED ABOVE WILL BE REPEATED AT THIS TIME	
5:00 p.m.	FREE TIME/DINNER ON YOUR OWN

Friday, January 22, 1982

8:00 a.m. - 8:30 a.m.	Coffee & Juice
8:30 a.m. - 12 noon	SESSION III: CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT: WHAT DO WE KNOW ABOUT EFFECTIVE CLASSROOMS? WHAT ARE THE IMPLICATIONS FOR TITLE I?
8:30 a.m. - 9:15 a.m.	SESSION OVERVIEW

David Holdzkom
Director
Research and Development Interpretation Service
CEMREL, Inc.
St. Louis, Missouri

9:15 a.m. - 9:30 a.m.	BREAK
9:30 a.m. - 12 noon	SMALL GROUP SESSIONS

GROUP 1: Classroom Organization and Effective Teaching

Ed Emmer
Acting Director
Classroom Organizationand Effective Teaching Project
The University of Texas Research and Development Center
Austin, Texas

GROUP 2: The Role of the Principal in Improving Basic Skills Instruction

Jane Stallings
Director
The Process of Teaching Basic Reading Skills in Secondary Schools Project
Teaching and Learning Institute
Mountain View, California

GROUP 3: Management Techniques for Multiethnic Learning Teams

John Hollifield
Student Team Learning Project
Center for Social Organization of Schools
Baltimore, Maryland

GROUP 4: An Early Childhood Management Program

Geraldine H. Jenkins
Director
East St. Louis Director Instruction Follow Through
East St. Louis, Illinois

12 noon - 12:30 p.m. SEMINAR WRAP-UP

Wilbert A. Cheatham
Director of Compensatory Education Programs
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
U. S. Department of Education
Washington, DC

Preston C. Kronkosky
Acting Executive Director, SEDL

Anna Hundley
Regional Exchange, SEDL

APPENDIX B

LIST OF PRESENTERS

Presenters for Central States
Title I Seminar
January 20-22, 1982
Austin, Texas

SEMINAR KEYNOTE/ORIENTATION

Wilbert A. Cheatham
Director of Compensatory
Education Programs
Office of Elementary and
Secondary Education
U.S. Department of Education
Washington, DC
202/245-3081

Brent Marriott
Special Assistant to Assistant
Secretary for Elementary and
Secondary Education
U.S. Department of Education
Washington, DC
202/245-8720

Scott Tuxhorn
Secretary's Regional Representative
Regional Office of Educational
Programs
1200 Main Tower Building
Dallas, TX 75202
214/767-3711

Session I--PROVIDING TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND USING RESOURCE BASES

Sheila Rosenblum
ABT Associates
226 W. Rittenhouse Square-Apt. 505
Philadelphia, PA 19103
215/732-6560

Pascal Trohanis
Director and Principal Investigator
of the Technical Assistance
Development System
University of North Carolina
330-A Damascus Church Road
Chapel Hill, NC 27514
919/962-2001

Nancy Baker Jones
Senior Dissemination Specialist
Regional Exchange Project
Southwest Educational Development
Laboratory
211 East 7th Street
Austin, TX 78701
512/476-6861

Greg Goodman
Needs Assessment and Dissemination
Specialist
Regional Exchange Project
CEMREL, Inc.
3120 59th Street
St. Louis, MO 63139
314/781-2900

Session I--PROVIDING TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND USING RESOURCE BASES (continued)

Mary Gunter
Arkansas State Facilitator Project
Region I
Boston Mount Cooperation
P. O. Drawer 248
Prairie Grove, AR 72753
501/846-2206

Gene Hall
Coordinator
Research on Improvement of Practice
Research & Development Center for
Teacher Education
The University of Texas at Austin
Education Annex
Austin, TX 78712
512/471-3844

Shirley Hord
Coordinator of Field Services
Research and Development Center
for Teacher Education
The University of Texas at Austin
Education Annex
Austin TX 78712
512/471-3844

Sandra Nichols
Fiscal Program Specialist
Compensatory Education Programs
Texas Education Agency
201 E. 11th Street
Austin, TX 78701
512/475-3327

Session II--EFFECTIVE INSERVICE--A VARIETY OF APPROACHES

Lovely Billups
Assistant Director
Educational Research & Dissemination
Project
American Federation of Teachers
11 Dupont Circle
Washington, DC 20036
202/797-4400

Gary Griffin
Coordinator, Research in Teacher Education
Research and Development Center for
Teacher Education
The University of Texas at Austin
Education Annex
Austin, TX 78712
512/471-7522

Jane Stallings
Stallings Teaching and Learning
Institute
1111 Fife Street
Palo Alto, CA 94302
415/948-9564

John Zirges
Inservice Specialist
Bethalto Unit #8 Schools
322 E. Central
Bethalto, IL 62010
618/377-7213

Al King
Coordinator, Ways to Improve
Education in Desegregated Schools
Southwest Educational Development
Laboratory
211 E. 7th Street
Austin, TX 78701
512/476-6861

MINI SESSIONS

Karen Rowlett
Assistant Project Director
Technical Assistance Center
Region VI
3724 Jefferson
Austin, TX 78731
512/453-7288

Betty Henslee
Assistant Director ESEA, Title I
Louisiana State Department of
Education
P. O. Box 44064
Baton Rouge, LA 70804
504/342-3341

Nancy Moore
Assistant Director
Illinois Statewide Facilitator
1105 East Fifth Street
Metropolis, IL 62960
618/524-2664

Jolene Schultz
Director
Missouri State Facilitator Center
310 North Providence Road
Columbia, MO 65201
314/449-8622

Donald G. May
Project Administrator
Focus Dissemination Project
Education Growth Exchange
121 E. Second Street
Hastings, MN 55033
612/437-3976

Phil Hawkins
Director of Planning
Michigan State Department
of Education
P. O. Box 30008
Lansing, MI 48909
517/373-7398

Yolanda Gonzales
Project Consultant
Corpus Christi Follow Through
Zavala Elementary School
3102 Highland
Corpus Christi, TX 78405
512/884-0611

Leticia Castaneda
Resource Center Specialist
Zavala Elementary School
3102 Highland
Corpus Christi, TX 78405
512/884-0611

Session III--CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT: WHAT DO WE KNOW ABOUT EFFECTIVE CLASSROOMS? WHAT ARE THE IMPLICATIONS FOR TITLE I?

David Holdzkom
Director
R&D Interpretation Services
CEMREL, Inc.
3120 59th Street
St. Louis, MO 63139
314/781-2900

Jane Stallings
Stallings Teaching and Learning
Institute
1111 Fife Street
Palo Alto, CA 94302
415/948-9564

Session III (continued)

Ed Emmer
Acting Director
Classroom Organization and
Effective Teaching Project
The University of Texas at Austin
Education Annex
Austin, TX 78712
512/471-1283

John Hollifield
Dissemination Coordinator
Center for Social Organization
of Schools
3505 N. Charles Street
Baltimore, MD 21218
301/338-8249

Geraldine H. Jenkins
Director
Project Follow Through
East St. Louis Board of Education
554 N. 27th
East St. Louis, IL 62205
618/274-2838

CONFERENCE COORDINATORS

Anna Hundley
Dissemination Specialist
SEDL/Regional Exchange Project
211 E. 7th Street
Austin, TX 78701
512/476-6861

Nancy Baker Jones
Senior Dissemination Specialist
SEDL/Regional Exchange Project
211 E. 7th Street
Austin, TX 78701
512/476-6861

Barbara L. Baylor
Senior Secretary
SEDL/Regional Exchange Project
211 E. 7th Street
Austin, TX 78701
512/476-6861

Carol Thomas
Director
CEMREL/Regional Exchange Project
3120 59th Street
St. Louis, MO 63139

APPENDIX C

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

TITLE I SEMINAR FOR CENTRAL STATES
PARTICIPANTS LIST

ARKANSAS

Emily Barrier
Consultant, State Facilitator Project
Arkansas Department of Education
State Capitol Mall
Little Rock, AR 72201
501/370-5038

Edwin Benning
Title I Area Supervisor
Arkansas Department of Education
State Capitol Mall
Little Rock, AR 72201
501/371-1803

B. J. Confer
Arkansas NDN State Facilitator
Arkansas Department of Education
State Capitol Mall
Little Rock, AR 72201
501/370-5038

Jo Cheek
Title I Area Supervisor
Arkansas Department of Education
State Capitol Mall
Little Rock, AR 72201
501/371-1801

Garland Doss
Title I Area Supervisor
Arkansas Department of Education
State Capitol Mall
Little Rock, AR 72201
501/371-5126

Elizabeth Gaston
Title I Area Supervisor
Arkansas Department of Education
State Capitol Mall
Little Rock, AR 72201
501/371-1803

Don Hindman
Title I Area Supervisor
Arkansas Department of Education
State Capitol Mall
Little Rock, AR 72201
501/371-1802

Bob Kerr
Title I Area Supervisor
Arkansas Department of Education
State Capitol Mall
Little Rock, AR 72201
501/371-5130

ILLINOIS

Robert H. Hardy
Manager of Compensatory Education
Illinois State Board of Education
100 N. 1st Street
Springfield, IL 62777
217/782-5534

Richard W. Naccarato
Professional Associate
Educational Testing Service
One American Plaza
Evanston, IL 60201
312/869-7700

??INDIANA

As of 1/13/82 there are no pre-registered participants.

IOWA

David C. Lidstrom
Director, Iowa State Facilitator Project
Grimes Office Building
De Monies, IA 50319
515/281-3111

LOUISIANA

James E. Green
Director, ESEA Title I
Louisiana State Department of Education
P. O. Box 44064
Baton Rouge, LA 70804
504/342-3336

Kathy Hilbun
SPUR Project Officer
Louisiana State Department of Education
Bureau of Elementary Education
P. O. Box 44064
Baton Rouge, LA 70804
504/342-3483

Betty Kraft
Assistant Director, Curriculum, Inservice, and Staff Development
Louisiana State Department of Education
Bureau of Elementary Education
P. O. Box 44064
Baton Rouge, LA 70804
504/342-1131

Glenda Lofton
Supervisor, SPUR Project
Louisiana State Department of Education
Bureau of Elementary Education
P. O. Box 44064
Baton Rouge, LA 70804
504/342-3483

(Canceled) Sue Wilson
Assistant Director of Dissemination
Bureau of Development
Louisiana State Department of Education
P. O. Box 44064
Baton Rouge, LA 70804
504/342-4268

MICHIGAN

Lyle DeBoer
Grand Rapids Public Schools
143 Bostwick, N.E.
Grand Rapids, MI 49503

Gladys Burks
Director, State and Federal Programs
Benton Harbor Area Schools
711 E. Britian Avenue
Benton Harbor, MI 49022
616/926-8253

Vern Smith
Michigan Department of Education
P. O. Box 30008
Lansing, MI 48909
517/373-3302

Clarence Wills
Supervisor, Compensatory Education Programs
Michigan Department of Education
P. O. Box 30008
Lansing, MI 48909
517/373-3666

Joseph Hirsch
5057 Woodward Avenue
Detroit, MI 48202
313/494-1683

??Niles Community Schools
(2 representatives)
111 Spruce Street
Niles, MI 49120
616/683-0731

??MINNESOTA

As of 1/13/82 there are no pre-registered participants.

MISSISSIPPI

A. C. Bilbo
Assistant Coordinator
ESEA Title I Unit
State Department of Education
P. O. Box 771
Jackson, MS 39205
601/354-59444

MISSISSIPPI (con't.)

Lance Eiland
Supervisor, Field Services
ESEA Title I Unit
State Department of Education
P. O. Box 771
Jackson, MS 39205
601/345-6944

Clint McInnis
Supervisor, Field Services
ESEA Title I Unit
State Department of Education
P. O. Box 771
Jackson, MS 39205
601/345-6944

Jim Sinclair
Supervisor, Field Services
ESEA Title I Unit
State Department of Education
P. O. Box 771
Jackson, MS 39205
601/345-6944

Dewey Townsend
Supervisor, Field Services
ESEA Title I Unit
State Department of Education
P. O. Box 771
Jackson, MS 39205
601/345-6944

MISSOURI

Don Snyder
Title I, Project Supervisor
P. O. Box 480
Jefferson City, MO 65102
314/751-4420

NEW MEXICO

Rex Hopson
Title I Coordinator
New Mexico Boys School
P. O. Box 52
Springer, NM 87747
505/483-2475

Lulu M. Valdez
Title I Coordinator
P. O. Box 617
Alamogordo, NM 88310
505/437-4010

??OHIO

As of 1/13/82 there are no pre-registered participants.

OKLAHOMA

Joe Birdwell
Deputy Administrator for
Compensatory Education
State Department of Education
2500 North Lincoln
Oklahoma City, OK 73105
405/521-2895

Bob Ranquist
Area Supervisor
State Department of Education
2500 North Lincoln
Oklahoma City, OK 73105
405/721-6237

Ken Smith
Oklahoma NDN State Facilitator
1216 S. Rankin
Edmond, OK 73034
405/341-2246

TEXAS

??Dicki Alston
Region 6, ESC
3332 Montgomery Road
Huntsville, TX 77340
713/295-9161

??Dixie Boyd
Consultant
P. O. Box 863
Houston, TX 77001
713/462-7708

Patsy Brunson
Migrant Program Coordinator
Region 15, ESC
P. O. Box 5199
San Angelo, TX 76902
915/655-6551

Oscar Cantu
Title I Migrant Administrator
Austin Independent School
District
1106 Clayton Lane, Suite 500 E
Austin, TX 78723
512/458-1291

??Frank Contreras
Division Director, Migrant
Education
Texas Education Agency
201 E. 11th Street
Austin, TX 78701
512/475-0772

Lucy Cox
Instructional Materials
Consultant
Region 5, ESC
2295 Delaware
Beaumont, TX 77703

??Rosalinda Eathorne
Fiscal Program Specialist I
Texas Education Agency
201 E. 11th Street
Austin, TX 78701
512/475-6523

George Franklin
Program Director, General
Education
Region 1, ESC
1900 West Schunior
Edinburg, TX 78539

Bonnie Garrington
NDN State Facilitator
Texas Education Agency
201 E. 11th Street
Austin, TX 78701
512/475-5656

Saul V. Hinojosa
Principal
Box 240
Freer, TX 78357
512/394-6800

Mary Francis Hull
NDN State Facilitator
Region 11, ESC
3001 North Freeway
Fort Worth, TX 76106
817/625-5311

Jan Johnson Keith
Curriculum Consultant/NDN
State Facilitator
Region 7, ESC
P. O. Box 1622
Kilgore, TX 75662
214/984-3071

Bill Lafferty
Texas NDN State Facilitator
1314 Hines Avenue
San Antonio, TX 78208
512/828-3551

Nancy Lowe
NDN State Facilitator
Region 15, ESC
P. O. Box 5199
San Angelo, TX 76902
915/655-6551

Margaret Looper
Region 6, ESC
3332 Montgomery Road
Huntsville, TX 77340
713/295-9161

TEXAS (con't.)

Don Morrow
Assistant Director
Region 5, ESC
2295 Delaware
Beaumont, TX 77703
713/835-5212

Bill Powell
Region 3, ESC
1905 Leary Lane
Victoria, TX 77901
512/573-0731

Ann Ray
Director, Instructional Services
P. O. Box 5199
San Angelo, TX 76902
915/655-3045

Ora Scott
Fiscal Program Specialist I
Division of Compensatory Education
Texas Education Agency
201 E. 11th Street
Austin, TX 78701
512/475-3371

R. J. Smalley
Fiscal Program Specialist I
Division of Compensatory Education
Texas Education Agency
201 E. 11th Street
Austin, TX 78701
512/475-3327

Pamela Tacket
Planning Assistant
Division of Compensatory Education
Texas Education Agency
201 E. 11th Street
Austin, TX 78701
512/475-3327

Bill Whitfield
Region 18, ESC
P. O. Box 6020
Midland, TX 79701
915/563-2380

Jim Wilson
Director, Division of Compensatory Education
Texas Education Agency
201 E. 11th Street
Austin, TX 78701
512/475-4126

Walter Rambo
NDN State Facilitator
Texas Education Agency
201 E. 11th Street
Austin, TX 78701
512/475-5656

Newlove Beulah
Research & Development Center for Teacher Education
The University of Texas
Education Annex
Austin, TX 78712

Leslie Huling
Research & Development Center for Teacher Education
The University of Texas
Education Annex
Austin, TX 78712

Karen B. Carsrud
Austin ISD
6100 Guadalupe
Austin, TX 78752

Rosailand Eathorne
Migrant Education
Texas Education Agency
201 E. 11 Street
Austin, TX 78701

Participants List (con't.)

Leroy Hendrick
Region VIII, ESC
100 N. Riddle
Mt. Pleasant, TX 75455

Jeannie Caraway
Region VIII, ESC
100 N. Riddle
Mt. Pleasant, TX 75455

Jacquelyn Harrison
Region XX, ESC
P. O. Box 1300
Richardson, TX 75080

Marj Wightman
Director, Division of
Dissemination
Texas Education Agency
201 E. 11th Street
Austin, TX 78701
512/475-5601

Henrietta Grooms
Region VII, ESC
P. O. Box 1622
Kilgore, TX 75662

Antonio Perez
Corpus Christi ISD
P. O. Box 110
Corpus Christi, TX 78405

Gloria Zipkowski
Technical Assistance Center
Region VI
3724 Jefferson
Austin, TX 78731

Mike Howard
Technical Assistance Center
Region VI
3724 Jefferson
Austin, TX 78731

Laura Williams
Region XIII, ESC
7703 N. Lamar
Austin, TX 78752

Earl P. Schubert
UT/TEA
Rt. 3 Box 262K
Spicewood, TX

Barbara Clements
Research & Development Center
for Teacher Education
The University of Texas
Education Annex
Austin, TX 78712

Arthur C. Hows
Technical Assistance Center
Region VI
3724 Jefferson Street
Austin, TX 78731

Jan Anderson
CITE
211 E. 7th Street
Austin, TX 78701
512/476-6861

Eva Westmoreland
CITE
211 E. 7th Street
Austin, TX 78701
512/476-6861

Deborah Daniels
CITE
211 E. 7th Street
Austin, TX 78701
512/476-6861

Participants List (con't)

WISCONSIN

Walter Burkholder
Wisconsin State NDN Facilitator
Department of Public Instruction
125 South Webester Street
P. O. Box 7941
Madison, WI 53707
608/267-7269

Nancy Lincoln
Title I Consultant
State Department of Public Instruction
125 South Webester Street
Madison, WI 53707
608/267-9144

OTHERS

KANSAS

Ken Gentry
Coordinator, State/Federal Programs Administrator
State Department of Education
120 E. 10th Street
Topeka, KS 66612
913/296-3161

Sandra Howdeshell
Community Education Center
1847 North Chawtaugua
Wichita, KS 67214
316/268-7762

Jo Ellen Ronson
Rushton Elementary School
6001 West 52nd
Shawnee Mission, KS 66202
913/722-0664

Kendall Stepheson
Rushton Elementary School
6001 West 52nd
Shawnee Mission, KS 66202
913/722-0664

NEBRASKA

Pat Thompson
Evaluation Specialist
Technical Assistance Center
American Institute for Research
1641 Summer #3
Lincoln, NE 68502
402/476-7061

SOUTH CAROLINA

Sidney Cooper
Deputy Superintendent of Instruction
State Department of Education
Rutledge Building
Columbia, SC 29201
803/758-3403

(Canceled) Jack Seurynck
Director of Federal Programs
State Department of Education
Rutheldge Building
Columbia, SC 29201
803/758-3403

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

George Blassingame
Chief of Education Services
U. S. Department of Education
Regional Office of Education Programs
1200 Main Tower Building
Dallas, TX 75202
214/767-3711

Edward Kelson
Education Program Specialist
U. S. Department of Education
Regional Office of Education Programs
1200 Main Tower Building
Dallas, TX 75202
214/767-3711

Participants List (con't.)

U. S. Dept. of Educ. (con't)

William Lobosco
Director of Division of Program
Development
Title I
U. S. Department of Education
Washington, DC 20202
202/245-9897

Helen MacArthur
Education Program Specialist
Title I
U. S. Department of Education
Washington, DC 20202
202/245-9897

Taunya Oates
Education Program Specialist
Title I
U. S. Department of Education
Washington, DC 20202
202/245-9897

B. F. Peters
U. S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue
Washington, DC 20202

SEDL STAFF

Anna Hundley
Nancy Baker Jones
Barbara L. Baylor
Martha Boethel
Sue Bryarly
Lynn Dawson
Renato Espinoza
Joyce Evans
Preston C. Kronkosky
Kim Kunetka
Cynthia Levinson
Barbara Ann Lynch
David Williams
Donna Bricker

APPENDIX D

EVALUATION DATA

FOR INDIVIDUAL SESSIONS

PARTICIPANT SUMMARY EVALUATION

Item 1: Reasons for attending seminar

Reason \ Rating	3	2	1	Total
Topics of high personal interest	12 52%	11 48%		23
Information useful back home	18 72%	7 28%		25
Topics relevant to my job	15 60%	9 36%	1 4%	25
Strongly encouraged by others	14 58%	6 25%	4 17%	24
Interact with peers	10 44%	9 39%	4 17%	23
Interact with presenters	16 67%	6 25%	2 8%	24

3=very important 2=somewhat important 1=not important

Item 2: Conference assessment

Reason \ Rating	4	3	2-1	Total
Objectives clearly defined	16 61%	9 35%	1 4%	26
Objectives addressed my needs	13 50%	8 31%	5 9%	26
Presentations clear	14 54%	12 46%		26
Presentations applicable to my work	12 46%	9 35%	5 19%	26
Materials applicable to my work	13 50%	10 38%	3 12%	26
Preconference materials helpful	17 65%	7 27%	2 8%	26
Preconference materials accurately portrayed seminar	18 72%	7 28%		25
Seminar well managed	22 85%	4 15%		26
Format & atmosphere conducive to learning	20 77%	6 23%		26
Facilities adequate	20 77%	6 23%		26
Seminar provided knowledge I can use in my work	9 47%	8 42%	2 11%	21
Seminar taught new skills I can use in my work	7 39%	10 56%	1 5%	18

4=absolutely yes 3=somewhat yes 2=somewhat no 1=absolutely no

PRESENTER EVALUATION

Item \ Rating	4	3	2	1	Totals
1. I had adequate time to prepare for this seminar	9 90%	1 10%			10
2. I was given adequate advance information regarding seminar objectives.	10 100%				10
3. I was given adequate advance information regarding seminar format.	8 80%	2 20%			10
4. I was given adequate advance information regarding my presentation.	8 80%	2 20%			10
5. Seminar objectives were clearly defined.	9 90%	1 10%			10
6. Seminar objectives were achieved.	3 30%	7 70%			10
7. Seminar objectives were appropriate to participant needs.	5 50%	3 30%	2 20%		10
8. The seminar format and atmosphere were conducive to learning.	7 70%	3 30%			10
9. Adequate time was provided for my presentation.	9 90%	1 10%			10
10. Adequate time was provided for questions and discussion.	10 100%				10
11. Physical facilities were adequate.	9 90%	1 10%			10
12. The seminar was well managed by Regional Exchange staff.	9 90%	1 10%			10
13. Participants indicated they will use the information I presented in their work.	2 29%	4 57%	1 14%		7
14. Participants indicated they will use information from the seminar in their work.	3 43%	4 57%			7

4=absolutely yes 3=somewhat yes 2=somewhat no 1=absolutely no

PARTICIPANT EVALUATION OF SESSION OVERVIEWS

Item 1: Relevance of Content

Session \ Rating	4	3	2	1	total
Providing technical assistance	27 57%	13 28%	7 15%	-	47
Effective inservice	19 38%	21 42%	7 14%	3 6%	50
Classroom management	24 86%	3 11%	1 3%	-	28
totals	70 56%	37 30%	15 12%	3 2%	125

Item 2: Quality of Presentation

Session \ Rating	4	3	2	1	total
Providing technical assistance	23 47%	20 41%	6 12%	-	49
Effective inservice	17 35%	15 31%	9 19%	7 15%	48
Classroom management	22 82%	3 11%	2 7%	-	27
totals	62 50%	38 31%	17 14%	7 5%	124

Item 3: Quality of Handouts and Materials

Session \ Rating	4	3	2	1	total
Providing technical assistance	33 73%	9 20%	2 5%	1 2%	45
Effective inservice	17 61%	5 18%	4 14%	2 7%	28
Classroom management	22 81%	3 11%	2 8%	-	27
totals	72 72%	17 17%	8 8%	3 3%	100

Ratings: 4=very good 3=good 2=fair 1=poor

PARTICIPANT EVALUATION OF SMALL GROUPS

SESSION I: PROVIDING TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Item 1: Relevance of Content

Group \ Rating	4	3	2	1	Totals
1. What is technical assistance?	7 70%	3 30%			10
2. Bringing about school change	10 100%				10
3. Regional Resources	4 80%	1 20%			5
4. Identifying essential program elements	7 54%	3 23%	3 23%		13
5. Basic skills and compensatory education	10 59%	6 35%	1 6%		17
totals	38 69%	13 24%	4 7%		55

Item 2: Quality of Presentation

Group \ Rating	4	3	2	1	Totals
1. What is technical assistance?	9 90%	1 10%			10
2. Bringing about school change	10 100%				10
3. Regional Resources	5 83%	1 17%			6
4. Identifying essential program elements	10 77%	2 15%	1 8%		13
5. Basic skills and compensatory education	10 55%	7 39%	1 6%		18
totals	44 77%	11 19%	2 4%		57

Item 3: Quality of Handouts and Materials

Group \ Rating	4	3	2	1	Totals
1. What is technical assistance?	7 78%		2 22%		9
2. Bringing about school change	9 90%	1 10%			10
3. Regional Resources	6 100%				6
4. Identifying essential program elements	10 77%	2 15%	1 8%		13
5. Basic skills and compensatory education	12 71%	5 29%			17
totals	44 80%	8 15%	3 5%		55

Item 4: Use of Time

Group \ Rating	4	3	2	1	Totals
1. What is technical assistance?	6 60%	3 30%	1 10%		10
2. Bringing about school change	7 70%	3 30%			10
3. Regional Resources	5 83%	1 17%			6
4. Identifying essential program elements	7 54%	4 31%	1 8%	1 7%	13
5. Basic skills and compensatory education	11 60%	6 34%	1 6%		18
totals	36 63%	17 30%	3 5%	1 2%	57

Ratings: 4=very good 3=good 2=fair 1=poor

PARTICIPANT EVALUATION OF SMALL GROUPS

SESSION II: EFFECTIVE INSERVICE

Item 1: Relevance of Content

Group \ Rating	4	3	2	1	Totals
1. Linking teachers and research	2 100%				2
2. Research for staff development	4 44%	4 44%	1 12%		9
3. Modifying teacher behavior	19 95%	1 5%			20
4. Inservice education models & guidelines	8 73%	3 27%			11
5. Improving student attitudes(Inservice Model)	8 80%	2 20%			10
totals	41 79%	10 19%	1 2%		52

Item 2: Quality of Presentation

Group \ Rating	4	3	2	1	Totals
1. Linking teachers and research	2 100%				2
2. Research for staff development	7 78%	2 22%			9
3. Modifying teacher behavior	18 90%	2 10%			20
4. Inservice education models & guidelines	8 73%	3 27%			11
5. Improving student attitudes(Inservice Model)	9 82%	2 18%			11
totals	44 83%	9 17%			53

Item 3: Quality of Handouts and Materials

Group \ Rating	4	3	2	1	Totals
1. Linking teachers and research	2 100%				2
2. Research for staff development	3 50%	3 50%			6
3. Modifying teacher behavior	19 95%	1 5%			20
4. Inservice education models & guidelines	6 55%	5 45%			11
5. Improving student attitudes(Inservice Model)	7 64%	4 36%			11
totals	37 74%	13 26%			50

Item 4: Use of Time

Group \ Rating	4	3	2	1	Totals
1. Linking teachers and research	2 100%				2
2. Research for staff developmnet	5 56%	4 44%			9
3. Modifying teacher behavior	18 90%	2 10%			20
4. Inservice education models & guidelines	9 82%	2 18%			11
5. Improving student attitudes(Inservice Model)	7 70%	3 30%			10
totals	41 79%	11 21%			52

Ratings: 4=very good 3=good 2=fair 1=poor

PARTICIPANT EVALUATION OF SMALL GROUPS

SESSION III: CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

Item 1: Relevance of Content

Group \ Rating	4	3	2	1	Totals
Classroom Organization & Effective Teaching	6 75%	1 13%	1 12%		8
Role of the Principal	10 91%	1 9%			11
Management Techniques for Multiethnic Teams	5 100%				5
Early Childhood Management Program	2 50%	1 25%	1 25%		4
totals	23 82%	3 11%	2 7%		28

Item 2: Quality of Presentation

Group \ Rating	4	3	2	1	Totals
Classroom Organization & Effective Teaching	5 63%	2 25%	1 12%		8
Role of the Principal	10 83%	2 17%			12
Management Techniques for Multiethnic Teams	3 60%	2 40%			5
Early Childhood Management Program	2 50%		2 50%		4
totals	20 69%	6 21%	3 10%		29

Item 3: Quality of Handouts and Materials

Group \ Rating	4	3	2	1	Totals
Classroom Organization & Effective Teaching	6 75%	2 25%			8
Role of the Principal	12 100%				12
Management Techniques for Multiethnic Teams	5 100%				5
Early Childhood Management Program	2 50%	1 25%	1 25%		4
totals	25 86%	3 10%	1 4%		29

Item 4: Use of Time

Group \ Rating	4	3	2	1	Totals
Classroom Organization & Effective Teaching	5 63%	2 25%	1 12%		8
Role of the Principal	11 92%	1 8%			12
Management Techniques for Multiethnic Teams	4 80%	1 20%			5
Early Childhood Management Program	2 50%	1 25%	1 25%		4
totals	22 76%	5 17%	2 7%		29

Ratings: 4=very good 3=good 2=fair 1=poor

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PARTICIPANT EVALUATION OF SMALL GROUPS
MINISESSIONS

Item 1: Relevance of Content

Group \ Rating	4	3	2	1	Totals
1. Quality Control in Title I Programs	8 80%	2 20%			10
2. Process Evaluation	7 78%	2 22%			9
3. Title I/NDN Collaboration	8 73%	2 18%	1 9%		11
4. Motivating Delinquents	4 66%	1 17%	1 17%		6
5. Michigan's Approach to ECIA	9 50%	8 44%	1 6%		18
totals	36 67%	15 28%	3 5%		54

Item 2: Quality of Presentation

Group \ Rating	4	3	2	1	Totals
1. Quality Control in Title I Programs	7 70%	3 30%			10
2. Process Evaluation	6 60%	4 40%			10
3. Title I/NDN Collaboration	8 73%	1 9%	2 18%		11
4. Motivating Delinquents	1 17%	3 50%	2 33%		6
5. Michigan's Approach to ECIA	11 61%	7 39%			18
totals	33 60%	18 33%	4 7%		55

Item 3: Quality of Handouts and Materials

Group \ Rating	4	3	2	1	Totals
1. Quality Control in Title I Programs	6 60%	4 40%			10
2. Process Evaluation	6 60%	4 40%			10
3. Title I/NDN Collaboration	6 60%	3 30%	1 10%		10
4. Motivating Delinquents		3 60%	2 40%		5
5. Michigan's Approach to ECIA	9 50%	8 44%	1 6%		18
totals	27 51%	22 41%	4 8%		53

Item 4: Use of Time

Group \ Rating	4	3	2	1	Totals
1. Quality Control in Title I Programs	8 80%	2 20%			10
2. Process Evaluation	6 60%	3 30%	1 10%		10
3. Title I/NDN Collaboration	8 73%	2 18%	1 9%		11
4. Motivating Delinquents	2 34%	2 33%	2 33%		6
5. Michigan's Approach to ECIA	7 44%	8 50%	1 6%		16
totals	31 59%	17 32%	5 9%		53

Ratings: 4=very good 3=good 2=fair 1=poor

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FOLLOWUP EVALUATION

Item 1: Reasons for attending seminar

Reason \ Rating	3		2		1		Total
Topics of high personal interest	34	50%	30	44%	4	6%	68
Information useful back home	38	57%	21	31%	8	12%	67
Topics relevant to my job	41	61%	22	33%	4	6%	67
Strongly encouraged by others to attend	19	30%	29	45%	16	25%	64
Interact with peers	35	53%	23	35%	8	12%	66
Interact with presenters	34	53%	28	44%		3%	64

3=very important 2=somewhat important 1=not important

Item 2: Conference assessment

Reason \ Rating	4		3		2-1		Total
Objectives clearly defined	38	53%	31	44%	2	3%	71
Objectives addressed my needs	20	30%	32	48%	15	22%	67
Presentations clear	34	49%	30	43%	6	8%	70
Presentations applicable to my work	24	35%	32	46%	13	19%	69
Materials applicable to my work	33	49%	24	35%	11	16%	68
Preconference materials helpful	31	47%	25	38%	10	15%	66
Preconference materials accurately portrayed seminar	33	50%	28	42%	5	8%	66
Seminar well managed	57	80%	14	20%			71
Format and atmosphere conducive to learning	42	59%	24	34%	5	7%	71
Facilities adequate	51	73%	17	24%	2	3%	70
Seminar provided knowledge I can use in my work	27	44%	25	40%	10	16%	62
Seminar taught new skills I can use in my work	18	29%	24	39%	20	32%	62

4=absolutely yes 3=somewhat yes 2=somewhat no 1=absolutely no

BEST COPY AVAILABLE